

REMARKS

In light of the above amendments and remarks to follow, entry of this amendment, reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Claims 20, 21, and 23-29 and amended claims 19 and 22 are in this application.

Claim 19, 28, and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kubo '659 in view of Su '714.

Independent claim 19, as amended herein, recites in part as follows:

“...a semi-transparent cover placed so that an outline of said apparent eyes of said robot can be seen only when said light emitting means flash.”

In explaining the above 103 rejection, the Examiner asserted that Kubo does not “expressly disclose a semi-transparent cover.” To cure such defect, the Examiner appears to rely on Su to disclose a semi-transparent cover. It is respectfully submitted that Su as applied by the Examiner (hereinafter “Su”) does not appear to disclose a semi-transparent cover placed so that an “outline of said apparent eyes of said robot can be seen only when said light emitting means flash.” Rather, Su appears to disclose that the outline of the eye is always displayed (see, for example, Figs. 4B and 5B where the concentric circles represent the outline of the eyes). Therefore, claim 1 is believed to be distinguishable from the applied combination of Kubo and Su.

Claims 28 and 29 depend on claim 19, and, due to such dependency, are believed to be distinguishable from the applied combination of Kubo and Su for at least the reasons previously described.

Claims 20, 21, and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kubo '659 in view of Su '714 as applied to claim 19 above, and further in

view of Ho '223. Claims 22-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kubo '659 in view of Su '714 and Ho '223 as applied to claims 20, 21, and 27 above, and further in view of Kamiya '772.

Claims 20-27 depend from claim 19, and, due to such dependency, are believed to be distinguishable from the applied combination of Kubo and Su for at least the reasons previously described. The Examiner does not appear to have relied on either Ho or Kamiya to overcome the above-described deficiencies of Kubo and Su. Accordingly, claims 20, 21, and 27 are believed to be distinguishable from the applied combination of Kubo, Su, and Ho, and claims 22-26 are believed to be distinguishable from the applied combination of Kubo, Su, Ho, and Kamiya for at least the reasons previously described.

In the event, that the Examiner disagrees with any of the foregoing comments concerning the disclosures in the cited prior art, it is requested that the Examiner indicate where, in the reference or references, there is the basis for a contrary view.

In view of the foregoing, entry of this amendment, favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 19-29 and the allowance of this application with claims 19-29 are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By: 

Dennis M. Smid
Reg. No. 34,930
(212) 588-0800